REPRINTS

FROM

The Journal of Oriental Research

MADRAS



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS
MYLAPORE

AN APPEAL.

GENTLEMEN,

In making this appeal to you we wish to inform you that this is the ONLY JOURNAL in SOUTH INDIA, which is dedicated purely to advanced research in the field of Oriental Learning. We are receiving articles from eminent scholars all over India. Such a journal has an important place in the sphere of higher culture. Due prominence is given to all sides of Oriental Studies.

Moreover, we have undertaken the publication of many rare books which exist only in the form of manuscripts. Sanskrit renderings of *original Buddhistic works* preserved in the *Tibetan Language* are also published for the first time. A critical and readable English translation of the "*Tolkappiyam*" with illustrations is being published. The articles published in this Journal cover the whole field of Oriental Literature—Linguistics, Philosophy, Literary Criticism, Astronomy, Dravidian Studies, Sastraic Research, etc.

The Annual Subscription is fixed at **Rs. 6**, so as to be within easy reach of everybody. We request you to become subscribers and to help us in enlisting others.

Yours faithfully,
K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AIYAR,
Managing Editor.

N.B.:—Orders may be sent either to

Mr. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar, B.A., B.L.,
"*The Ashrama,*" *Luz, Mylapore.*

or to

Mr. V. Duraiswami, B.A.,
Manager,
Journal of Oriental Research,
Sanskrit College Street, MYLAPORE.

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

Madras Oriental Series.

1. Vibhrama-Viveka of Maṇḍanamiśra. Price As. 12.
2. Vīṇāvāsavadattam (available only up to the end of the third act). Price As. 8.
3. Tolkāppiyam.—With English Notes and Translation.
   Vol. I. Eḻuttatikāram. Price Re. 1.
   Vol. II. Collatikāram. Price Re. 1.
4. Madhyamakāvatāra of Candrakīrti,—Rendered into Sanskrit from Tebetan version. (In the Press.)
5. Tripādīnītinayanam of Murārimiśra. (In the Press.)
6. History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and their relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit. Price Rs. 6.


Fig. 1.


Fig. 2.


Fig. 3.


Fig. 4.

RECENT PROGRESS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF SUMATRA, HINDU-BUDDHIST PERIOD.

BY

PROFESSOR K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI,
University of Madras.

The archaeological traces of the first centuries of Hindu Sumatran history were till recently somewhat disappointing. Repeated search in and near Palembang, the site of the ancient Śrī Vijaya, did not yield anything at all commensurate with the great role of Śrī Vijaya in the medieval history of South Eastern Asia; and all that was known of Palembang and other archaeological sites of Sumatra was summed up by Dr. Bosch in Bijlage C of the O. V. for 1930; and a brief account of antiquities including inscriptions from Sumatra also appears from the pen of Heine-Geldern at pp. 322-27 of SUMATRA, ITS HISTORY AND PEOPLE by E. N. Loeb (1935). Since then the results of some excavations undertaken by F. M. Schnitger at Palembang and other places with the support of the Archaeological Service of Java have been made available in a series of tentative reports published by him and Dr. Stutterheim who has worked at the inscriptions discovered by Schnitger. Our aim is to draw attention to the chief additions to our knowledge of Sumatran archaeology brought about by Schnitger's work.

In January 1935 Schnitger recovered a number of inscribed stones from Telagabatu of which we shall say more presently. Besides, he recovered a fair number of *makara* fragments in terra cotta, and discovered ruins of several brick structures at present containing a number of Mahomedan graves, but originally unmistakably Hindu in character, either Śaivite or Buddhist. All these brick structures are found in a place called Gedingsura which, according to tradition, takes its name from a nobleman from Demak who came to Palembang after the fall of Madjapahit and there founded a dynasty which held sway till the year 1823. Another important find was a copper Buddha standing on a double lotus *pīṭha*. The total height of the image is

16½ cms. The right hand is missing, and the left slightly bent in *vitarkamudrā*. The upper garment covers the left shoulder, leaves the right bare, passes under the right arm and falls stiffly on the sides well below the knees, covering the left arm up to the wrist. A lower garment hangs down a little below the upper, reaching almost to the ankles. The lotus pedestal is hollow and somewhat damaged. The style of this image recalls the prince Śākyamuni of the Leiden Museum reproduced as No. 86 in With's JAVA.

Schnitger had the good fortune to identify the head of the well-known broken Buddha statue of Bukit Seguntang.[1] The fragments of this celebrated image were first signified by Westenenk in 1920 and part of the image reconstructed in 1928 by Perquin. The head now seen to belong to it was first discovered in 1914 by the Archaeological Service of Java and has been preserved in the Batavia Museum since. This beautiful statue is undoubtedly of the school of Amaravati and furnishes sure proof of the antiquity of Buddhism in Palembang (fig. 1.)

In Gedingsura to the east of Palembang was also found, as a result of an excavation undertaken by Luning under the auspices of the Municipality of Palembang, a beautiful fragment, 1.18 metres high, of the image of a divinity of the middle Javanese period, highly ornamented with ear-rings, armlets, a collar for the neck and clothing with loops on both the hips and falling near to the anklets; head, arms and feet missing.

Schnitger also mentions three images in bronze he got from the natives of Seguntang:—

1. a Kubera 7½ cms. high,
2. a Lokeśvara 8½ cms. high, arms and left foot missing,
3. another Lokeśvara, arms and feet missing, 9½ cms. high,

Nos. 2 and 3 showing Cham influence. He also noticed two bronze images recovered from the river Palembang and now in the possession of Mr. A. van Doorninck. One is an image of the Buddha preaching seated in the European mode on a rectangular chair with a tall back and double lotus cushion for his feet (fig. 2.) The back of the chair comprises a rectangular part with a small column on either side, the whole surmounted by a

1. This name seems to have been that of a mythical mountain after which at least three hillocks in Sumatra were named. *Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari*, Schnitger, pp. 7-8.

high triangle supported by *makara* heads on the sides and ornamented with four stylised flames on each side. The image is very beautiful and doubtless belongs to the middle Javanese period. Height 14½ cms. The other bronze is a Vairocana seated with legs crossed on a double lotus cushion set upon a rectangular *pīṭha.* The hands are held in front of the chest, the right hand enclosing the fore-finger of the left. There is a nimbus round the head, and the back piece betrays Cham influence and was surmounted by an umbrella which has disappeared (fig. 3). A stone Amitaba 24½ cms. high, also taken out of the river, is in the possession of the same gentleman.

These numerous finds, though none of them perhaps of great interest individually, are still of considerable importance taken together, as they constitute a tangible proof of the real antiquity of a site which seemed devoid of all archaeological interest.

We may turn now to the inscribed stones mentioned at the outset. They are nine in number, of which only five have been examined by Stutterheim, four still remaining to be photographed and studied. The first inscription in Pallava script is a fragment of four letters, reading

Śikṣa prajña.

It must have formed part of an inscription engraved on a smoothly worked stone tablet. The date of the inscription may be put as the second half of the 7th century A. D. The second inscription in six lines, not yet deciphered, is in Pallava script of the second half of the eigth century A. D. The remaining three inscriptions are on natural stones of varying sizes, picked up from the river; the characters of all of them are Pallava, and of the first half of the 8th century A. D. The most complete of these inscriptions is in two lines and reads:—

(ja)yasiddhayā
tra Sarvasatva.

Stutterheim's remarks on Jayasiddhayātrā are so important that they may be translated in full here. "On the significance of this term there has been difference of opinion. In my view the standpoints of different scholars may be combined in the translation, 'pilgrimage for victory', by which is meant that a magical power necessary for victory is obtained by a pilgrimage, though

possibly people did not realise the magic character of the word *siddha* (for *siddhi*).

"The expression *siddhayātrā* or *siddhiyātrā* signifies, according to the Lexicons, a pilgrimage undertaken to achieve an object which is done usually by supernatural means. I do not believe that, as Coedes thinks, it was exclusively the receipt of magic power. There is a little difference between the getting of *Barakat* (for I would compare this with the Javanese usage) and the acquisition of magic power as it obtains in Bali by tāntric means. The prefixing of the word *jaya* (conquest) makes it probable that we must here think of princes who betook themselves to a particular holy place in order that there they may receive the blessing needed for a conquest (or success, for *jaya* need not always imply victory in war). The expression *Śrī-vijaya-jayasiddhayātrā* of the inscription of Keḍukan Bukit may then signify that the prince mentioned therein had completed a pilgrimage to the place of the charter which was necessary for success against Śrīvijaya. It is self-evident that if this interpretation is correct, there can be no question in this charter of the foundation of the kingdom as has sometimes been thought. Indeed Coedes has expressed doubts on good grounds regarding this matter.

"At the same time I will draw attention to the fact that all the inscriptions in which our expression occurs (with the exception of that of Campā) are written on natural stones or round boulders and not on a so-called charter-stone. This must doubtless have a significance. It seems to me that the character of a votive inscription becomes emphasised thereby, at least that it becomes doubtful whether it is the usual type of a royal inscription." Stutterheim then proceeds to state that in all probability there was a temple in Palembang to which persons resorted in different centuries (7th, 8th, 10th) to receive Barakat. He draws attention to the inscription of Talang-Tuwo and to the celebrated stone Buddha of Bukit Seguntang as supporting this view. The usually accepted view that Palembang was in fact Śrīvijaya is rejected by Stutterheim, who thinks that according to Chinese sources Śrīvijaya lay on the Equator. This last statement is of considerable interest and scholars will await eagerly Stutterheim's proofs for the new view he has stated.

Less than a hundred miles to the North of Palembang, on the east coast of Sumatra, we reach the mouth of the stream called Batang Hari (Djambi river). A few miles higher up the river, there are two places of importance to archaeology, Muara Djambi on the northern bank and Djambi on the southern bank of the river. Two Buddha statues in a north Indian style, apparently related to traditions of Gupta Art, are already known from Djambi. The ruins of Muara Djambi were first noticed by an Englishman, Captain S. C. Crooke, in 1820 and formed the subject of brief notices by T. Adam in the Outheidkundig Verslagen for 1921 and 1922. In March 1936, Schnitger undertook a more systematic survey and carried out some trial excavations. He discovered the remains of no fewer than seven groups of ruined buildings spread along the northern bank of the river, mostly temples built of brick, generally facing east and occasionally south. In the absence of any inscriptions, the style of the structures is the only guide to their age and Schnitger is inclined to place them in the 11th or 12th century A. D. There can be little doubt that these considerable structures, which do not fall behind others found elsewhere in Sumatra in their size or beauty, must have formed part of a large city, perhaps larger than Palembang itself. Schnitger is inclined to identify this site with that of the ancient Malāyu, the Malaiyūr of Rājendra Cōḷa's inscription; he suggests that Muslim sultans of modern Djambi used much material from the old ruins of Muara Djambi in their buildings, and possibly carried some of the Hindu images also from Muara Djambi in the process. He argues that though Hindu images have been found in Djambi so far, no relics of any old Hindu structure have been brought to light. We must necessarily await the results of further exploration before the surmises of Schnitger are accepted as final.

One of the most remarkable finds from the banks of the Batang Hari (from Sungei Langsat on its upper course), was a large Bhairava image in 1906. Schnitger publishes a clearer photograph of the image than has appeared so far of this enormous statue (fig. 4), which he describes in the following terms: "On a pedestal of eight skulls, there is a slab, a double-lotus-cushion (*padmapīṭha*), bearing a lying figure with legs folded under the body. On this figure stands a short, thick-set figure with a knife and a skull in the hands; snakes surround the

ankles and wrists, and form arm bands and ear ornaments. The girdle is held by a clasp in the form of the head of a monster and there hangs from its mouth a pearl garland with a bell at its bottom. From the left shoulder where a knot or loop is seen, a broad ribbon falls obliquely on the chest; another ornamental band is also seen in a similar position. Chest and legs are hirsute; there is also the moustache, and at the corners of the mouth are sculptured little projecting horns. *Makaras* with cloven eyes and flowers with hanging seed-garlands serve as ear-ornaments. In the tall coiffure sits the Buddha Akṣobhya. The statue is 4.41 m. high." Both Schnitger and Stutterheim agree that this Bhairava is a representation of Ādityavarman, a ruler of Menangkabau in the 14th century. There is much evidence at hand to show that Ādityavarman was a Bhairava worshipper. He records in one inscription in 1347 that he and his wife Mataṅginī, performed a dance, and this performance is referred to in a technical expression of tantric Buddhism in the phrase: '*maṇidvaya nāṭakakaraṇa*'. Again, an inscription of 1370 at Suroaso records the consecration of Ādityavarman as Bhairava, that on this occasion he sat on a pile of corpses, and that by this ceremony he became one with Kṣetrajña, a form of Bhairava, according to Monier-Williams.

The third area with which Schnitger has concerned himself, Padang Lawas (the modern district of Tapuneli), lies further north and includes the valley of the upper Kampar river; near the west coast of Central and Northern Sumatra. It was surveyed by Dr. Bosch in 1930 and in his interesting report of the tour, he drew attention to some stone and bronze images marked by unmistakably south Indian artistic influences roughly of the 9th to the 11th centuries A. D. In June and September 1935, and April 1936, Schnitger carried out some excavations in this region, and the results are indeed very interesting. But we cannot go into all the details here, and must confine ourselves to mentioning two of the most significant finds. While clearing the cella of a *biara* (Vihāra) at Sangkilon, Schnitger came by a small inscribed gold plate 5×13 cm. On one side of it, in the middle is a rectangle engraved with Vajra-points, and enclosing one syllable; four lines of writing on either side, in all eight, constitute part of a Nāgarī inscription which must have begun on another plate, not forthcoming now, which might have been

fastened crosswise on the extant one. The inscription, according to Dr. Bosch, seems to have reference to the consecration of an image of Yamāri, with 8 faces, 24 eyes and a Kapāla-mālā; Dīpamkara is also mentioned.

Pamutung is the greatest temple centre in Padang Lawas. The chief temple of Pamutung, like that of Sangkilon, says Schnitger, has two floors (terraces) and a rectangular roof rising by stages to a considerable height. Climbing a flight of steps we enter an enclosed space which contains the *pradakṣiṇa* path. A second flight of steps leads to a second smaller terrace, also with a *pradakṣiṇa* path going round. A third and smaller flight of steps leads to the cella guarded on either side of the entrance by male figures, life-size, standing on a monster-head (rearing lions sometimes take the place of these *dvārapālakas*). The portal is surmounted by a monster-head also. The smaller temples have only one terrace, and the cella is always nearly cubical, varying from two or three metres. At Pamutung was found the upper half of a female statue, well-modelled, 43 cm. high, with hands in *añjali;* large knobs in the ears, eyes wide open, and two curved fangs at the corners of the mouth; Schnitger considers this to be the representation of a queen as a Bhairavī; proof of the bhairava-cult practised in this region also. This only confirms conclusions reached earlier by Dr. Bosch and others regarding the Vajra-Bhairava character of the religious practices of Padang Lawas. This image, like the bronze image of a woman from Biara I of Bahal, also shows south Indian influence. According to Schnitger the art of Padang Lawas owes something to South India; it shows also Cham influence in a measure; with the art of Java it seems to have had, however, no direct connection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Palembang door F. M. Schnitger uitgegeven bij K. A. Ebeling te Palembang.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Palembang door F. M. Sehnitger Bijlage A. verslag over de gevonden inscriptie's door Dr. W. F. Stutterheim uitgegeven bij K. A. Ebeling te Palembang.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Palembang door F. M. Schnitger Bijlage B. Addenda en Corrigenda.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Palemband door F. M. Schnitger Bijlage C. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1936.

Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari door F. M. Schnitger Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1936.

Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari door F. M. Schnitger Bijlage A. Utrecht, 1936.

Oudheidkundige vondsten in Padang Lawas door F. M. Schnitger Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1936.

Oudneidkundiga vondsten in Padang Lawas (Midden Tapanoeli) door F. M. Schnitger overgedrukt uit Elsevier's geillustreerd manschrift.

SELECT OPINIONS

Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.—This evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.—Your excellent Issue.

F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory. . . . . A journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January, 1927.— . . . . . This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly written articles: a pretty start!

"Bombay Chronicle," 12th December, 1926.— . . . . The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

"Indian Review," November, 1927.—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research. . . . . The influence of Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning. . . . . . .

"New India," 20th December, 1926.—. . . . . The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

"Hindu," 9th February, 1927.— . . . . . The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.—. . . . . The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work. . . . .

Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.— . . . . It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.— . . . . I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the originality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions. . . . .

THE CEYLON EXPEDITION OF JAṬĀVARMAN VĪRA PĀṆḌYA

BY PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, M.A.,

The University, Madras.

About the middle of the thirteenth century A.D. the Pāṇḍyan kingdom was ruled by two rulers—there might have been others—a Sundara Pāṇḍya and a Vīra Pāṇḍya, both bearing the prenomen Jaṭāvarman. The former is the most celebrated of the rulers of the second empire, a great warrior and builder, whose achievements are found recorded in a number of inscriptions in Sanskrit and Tamil. These inscriptions occur in all the Tamil districts and in Nellore and Cuddapah. Sundara Pāṇḍya, whose reign began towards the close of April 1251 A.D. was ably assisted by Vīra Pāṇḍya who came to power about two years later. The inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya, not yet as well studied as those of his elder contemporary, often corroborate and confirm facts recorded in Sundara's inscriptions. We shall consider the more important records of Vīra Pāṇḍya and in particular discuss the relations between the Pāṇḍyan kingdom and Ceylon in this period; incidentally we shall see that the Pāṇḍyas must have maintained a live contact with the Hindu kingdoms across the seas, a contact of which we have only a very few traces left in contemporary records.

Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscription says that he levied a tribute of precious jewels and elephants from the ruler of Ceylon :

tulangoḷi maṇiyuñ-jūḻi vēḻamuṁ
Ilaṅgai kāvalanai-yiṟai koṇḍaruḷi.

In the subjugation of Ceylon that is hinted at here, Vīra Pāṇḍya must have taken a prominent part; and this becomes clear from the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya. The Ceylonese chronicle *Cūḷavamsa* has also preserved data of great value for a correct understanding of the occurrences in Ceylon.[1]

The exaction of the tribute of elephants and pearls from the ruler of Ceylon is mentioned in the inscriptions of Sundara Pāṇḍya from his seventh regnal year, *i.e.* from about 1258 A.D.[2] In the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya, the conquest of Ceylon is briefly mentioned together with that of the Cōḷa country and the subjugation of the Śāvaka ruler in the words:

"In the tenth year of King Jaṭāvarman *alias* Tribhuvankacakravatin Śrī Vīra, Pāṇḍya-dēva who was pleased to take the Sōṇāḍu, Īḷam and the Śāvagan's crown together with his crowned head."[3] The tenth year of Vīra Pāṇḍya would be about 1263 A.D. and in an inscription dated the 73rd day of the eleventh year, we find detailed account of the expedition against Ceylon

---

[1] Attention was drawn to the passages in the *Cuḷavamsa* by Kern in 1896—*Twee Krijgstochten* uit den Indischen Archipel tegen Ceilon (BKI, 1896, pp 240-45); Ferrand was, I think, the first writer to connect the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya with the *Cuḷavamsa* account of the invasions against Ceylon—*JA* : 11 : 20 (1922), pp. 47-51 and 226-9); I have not seen Krom's article *De ondergang van Śrīvijaya* in the 'Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde'—Deel 62, Serie B, No. 5 (1926) pp. 149-71—which is characterised by Coedes as 'une remarquable essai de synthese historique'. The paper '*A propos de la chute du royaume de Śrivijaya*' (BKI, 1927, pp. 459 ff) of the last mentioned writer is important. See also Krom—*Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, pp. 334-5.

[2] *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, p. 161.

[3] 588 of 1916. The text (1.1) is: Svasti Śrī Kōccaḍaiya-panmarāna tiripuvanac-cakravattigaḷ Śōṇāḍum-Īḷamum Sāvagan muḍiyum muḍittalaiyuṅ goṇḍaruḷiya śrī Vīra-Pāṇḍiya-dēvaṟkku yāṇḍu 10—vadu. For the meaning of *muḍittalaikoṇḍaruḷiya* see—*The Colas*, i., p. 170.

and of the part of the Śāvaka ruler in it. So far the full text of this account is available in only one copy, that from Kuḍumiyâmalai in the Pudukkottah State.[1] This account is part of a long *praśasti* of Vīra Pāṇḍya beginning *tirumagaḷ vaḷar mulai*; but an inscription from Sēndamaṅgalam dated in the ninth year (1262)[2] with this *praśasti* does not contain the long passage relating to the Ceylon expedition; while another version of the same *praśasti* from Āttūr (Tinnevelly District)[3] is of no use, as it is fragmentary and undated. Two other versions of the same *praśasti* have been traced in Daḷapatisamudram (Tinnevelly District) both dated in the fourth year (1257)[4] and neither containing the passage relating to the Ceylon expedition.

Now, all these inscriptions, even those which do not contain the narrative of the Ceylon expedition, give a long list of countries that acknowledged the suzerainty of Vīra Pāṇḍya and sent tributes to his palace; this list includes Kaḍāram[5] besides China and Rāmañña (Arumaṇam). I do not think that the mention of Kaḍāram here has any historical significance. It only means that Kaḍāram was one of the countries known to the composer of the *praśasti*. Hence the occurrence Kaḍāram in the high-flown list of subject countries in 1257 cannot be taken to mean that a conflict between Vīra Pāṇḍya and the king of Kaḍāram had taken place by that time, and that Vīra Pāṇḍya had come out victorious in it. The exact context in which Kaḍāram occurs in these inscriptions will be seen from the following section of the *praśasti*:—

"Gangam, Gauḍam, Kaḍāram, Kāśipam, Kongam, Kudiram, Kōsalam, Māḷuvam, Arumaṇam, Śōnagam,

---

[1] 356 of 1906 Pd. 366.

[2] 480 of 1930.

[3] 467 of 1930.

[4] 8 and 9 of 1929. The regnal year of No. 9 is clear in the impression.

[5] ARE. 1912 II 39. 467 of 1930, however, does not include this name

Cīnam, Avanti, Karunaḍam, Īḻam, Kalingam, Telingam, Pepanam (?), Daṇḍakam (or Daṇḍanam (?), and Paṇḍaram —the kings of these and all other lands, and the strong *maṇḍalikas*, having entered the victorious gate of the palace in the jewelled mansions of which the three drums reverberated, awaited the convenience (of Vīra Pāṇḍya), made obeisance at his feet and presented before him the dark elephants and the treasure (they had brought as tribute)."

It will be seen that this is court-poetry, not histoy; the names of countries have been chosen with a view to euphony and metrical effects, and there is no attempt here to state facts.

The Kuḍumiyāmalai version of the *praśasti* is, as has been pointed out already, unique in its account of the Ceylon war of Vīra Pāṇḍya. The text is corrupt and not easy to make out in all its details. This part of the *praśasti* opens with a statement of the object of the expedition; there are serious gaps in the text here, but we can see that there was some dispute in Ceylon, that one of the ministers had invoked Pāṇḍyan intercession, and that the king's aim was to uphold in proper form the ancient practice of royalty (*araiśiyal vaḻakkam neṟippaḍu nāṭṭuṇ-guṟippinuḷ*). Then we learn that among the kings of Ceylon one was killed on the battlefield and all his troops, treasures and paraphernalia confiscated (*araiśu-keḻu-dāyam aḍaiya vāri*), after which the double carp (the Pāṇḍya emblem) was put upon the fine flags waving on the Kōṇamalai and the Trikūṭagiri, another king (of Ceylon) was compelled to surrender his elephants as tribute. Finally, the son of the Śāvaka, who had formerly disregarded commands and evinced hostility, came and prostrated (before Vīra Pāṇḍya) and was duly rewarded. The text is difficult here and so far as I can make it out, the Śāvaka's son was presented with the anklet of heroes (Vīrakkaḻal), was taken round in procession on an elephant, and was permitted to proceed at once to Anurāpuri[1]

[1] This important statement is based on what I consider the most likely emendation of an obscure phrase. *Vide* Appendix where I give the text with some notes on readings.

because it was thought (by Vīra Pāṇḍya) that it was only proper that the son should rule the vast land of Ceylon formerly ruled by his father.

So far the evidence of Pāṇḍyan inscriptions. The facts ascertained from them may be set down as follows:—

1255 A.D.—Kaḍāram mentioned in Vīra Pāṇḍya's *praśasti*.

1258 A.D.—Ceylonese king already subject to Sundara Pāṇḍya.

1263 A.D.—Vīra Pāṇḍya's conquest of Īḻam and the Śāvagan first mentioned.

1264 A.D.—Details of the expedition of Vīra Pāṇḍya against Ceylon, its two kings, and the son of the Sāvaga (Kuḍumiyāmalai inscription which like other inscriptions from 1255 onwards includes Kaḍāram among states tributary to Vīra Pāṇḍya).

If these facts were all that we had access to, we should be inclined to disregard the rhetorical mention of Kaḍāram in Vīra Pāṇḍya's *praśasti* as of no historical value, and to hold that the Śāvagan or his son who made his submission to Vīra Pāṇḍya after a futile effort at resistance was a representative of some alien line that had established itself in a part of Ceylon; for we know that the island was for a long time the happy hunting ground of adventurers from different lands in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and that bickerings among rival dynasties of Kalinga, Tamil and Malayāla and even N. Indian origin, and military risings and civil commotions disturbed the peace of the land.[1]

Let us now turn to the evidence from the side of Ceylon. By Geiger's scheme of chronology, all the dates given above from Pāṇḍyan inscriptions fall in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II, 1236-71 A. D.[2] The *Cūḷavamsa* gives a glowing account of this reign and does not record any reverses experienced by the Ceylonese ruler. To-

---

[1] Cf. The *Colas*, i., pp. 296 ff., and Codrington: *Short History of Ceylon*, Chh. IV and V.

[2] *Cūḷavamsa*, ii., p. xiv.

wards the end of his reign, on the other hand, King Parakkamabāhu sums up his own achievements as follows :—[1]

"From my father I have inherited alone (the province of Māyāraṭṭha but have now again conquered the two other provinces and brought the three kingdoms completely under one umbrella. All the Damiḷas who were for him invincible, I have vanquished and all the kings of the Vanni dwelling here and there in mountain and wilderness I have brought over to my side. Having spread my fame everywhere also in foreign lands, I have for long held sway in just fashion. I have brought hither king's daughters from Jambudīpa with gifts and thereby made the nobles in the foreign land your kinsmen. The heroes of the Paṇḍus and the Cōḷas, the kings sprung from the dynasties of the Sun and Moon, have sent me diadems and ornaments."

The relation between Ceylon and the Tamil kingdoms depicted here is directly opposed to the evidence of the Pāṇḍya inscriptions; not only is there no question here of the subordination of Ceylon to Pāṇḍya rule, but there is not even a hint of the campaign of Vīra Pāṇḍya, and the Pāṇḍyan and Cōḷa rulers are said to have honoured the Ceylonese ruler by sending him presents.

The Jāvakas are mentioned twice in this period in the Cūḷavamsa.[2] On both occasions they invaded Ceylon under the leadership of Candabhānu and were repulsed. The first occasion was in the 11th year of Parakkamabāhu II, say 1247 A.D. :—[3]

"When the eleventh year of the reign of this king had arrived, a king of the Jāvakas known by the name of Candabhānu landed with a terrible Jāvaka army under the treacherous pretext that they also were followers of the Buddha. All these wicked Jāvaka soldiers who invaded

[1] CV. ch. 87, vv. 24–29.

[2] This is the continuation of the *Mahāvamsa* and often described by that name.

[3] CV. ch. 83 vv. 36–48.

every landing place and who with their poisoned arrows, like to terrible snakes, without ceasing harassed the people whomever they caught sight of, laid waste, raging in their fury, all Lankā. Just as flashes of lightning with floods of water (visit) a place destroyed by lightning with flames of fire, so Lankā which had been harassed by Māgha and others was ravaged anew by the Jāvakas. Then the king sent forth his sister's son, the heroic prince Vīrabāhu with soldiers to fight the Jāvakas. The fearful Rāhu, namely Vīrabāhu, with his terrible appearance completely destroyed (the moon-light, namely) Candabhānu in the fields of heaven, namely in the battle. He placed his heroic Sīhala soldiers here and there and began to open fight with the Jāvaka warriors. The good Sīhala warriors, sure in aim, the archers, shattered in pieces with their sharply pointed arrows, in the battle the countless number of arrows whizzing against them with their poisoned tips which were shot swiftly one after the other by the Jāvaka soldiers from a machine. Going forth to the combat like Rāma, Prince Vīrabāhu slew numbers of Jāvakas, as Rāma slew the Rakkasas. The *Veramba* wind, namely Vīrabāhu, possessed of great vehemence, shattered again and again the forest wilderness, namely the Jāvaka foes. After thus putting to flight the Jāvakas in combat, he freed the whole region of Lankā from the foe."

At the time of the second inroad of Candabhānu, Parakkamabāhu II was no longer ruling actively, but was occupying himself in works of piety after laying the burden of the government on his son Vijayabāhu IV. This means that the invasion took place sometime about 1271 A.D. or a little earlier. "At that time the Lord of men Candabhānu, formerly beaten after hard fighting, having collected from the countries of the Paṇḍus and Cōḷas and elsewhere many Damiḷa soldiers, representing a great force, landed with his Jāvaka army in Mahātittha. After the king had brought over to his side the Sīhalas dwelling in Padi, Kurundi and other districts, he marched to

Subhagiri. He set up there an armed camp and sent forth messengers with the message: 'I shall take Tisīhala; I shall not leave it to thee. Yield up to me therefore together with the tooth relic of the sage, the bowl relic and the royal dominion. If thou wilt not, then fight.' Thereupon Vijayabāhu summoned the Ruler Vīrabāhu, took counsel with him, had a strong force equipped for him and spake: 'Hurrah, to-day both of us shall see the strength of our arms.' Then the two set forth, surrounded the great army of Candrabhānu on all sides and fought a great battle, terrible as a combat of Rāma. Then were the hostile warriors subdued in battle, and weaponless, the soldiers of the foe wandered around, prayed and implored, tortured by fear, were benumbed, trembled, begged for mercy in the fight, whined and grieved full of terror. In their distress certain of the foe fled to the forest, others to the sea, others again to the mountains. After Vijayabāhu had thus fought and slain many soldiers, he sent the Lord of men Candrabhānu flying defenceless. But the loveliest women of his court and all the elephants and horses, the swords and many other weapons, the entire treasure, the trumpets of victory, the banner of victory—all these he sent to his father.

"Having in this way fought the fiery battle, conquered the province and won the Victory, he united Lankā under the umbrella of his dominions".[1]

In 1896, Kern, who first drew attention to these passages in the Ceylonese chronicle, pointed out that in the second half of the 13th century no prince of the name Candrabhānu was known to Javanese history, and that he might have been a prince from Sumatra (also called Jāvaka sometimes) though little was known of the state of affairs in Sumatra at the time.[2] More recently, Ferrand explained the term Jāvaka as applicable to Sumatra;[3] but Bosch has expressed the view that the term must be

[1] CV. Ch. 88. vv. 62-76.

[2] TBG. (VI 2). 46 (1896), pp. 244-45.

[3] JA. 11 : 20 (1922), pp. 163 ff, esp. 172.

taken to stand for the entire island kingdom (het geheele eilandenrijk) ruled by the Mahārāja and in particular, the present Java;[1] Coedes has argued that Jāvaka, though phonetically corresponding to Zābag of the Arab writers, need not necessarily be its geographical equivalent, and that it is best accepted as simply an ethnic name for all Indonesians—simplement un nom ethnique designant les Indonesians.[2]

Krom was the first writer to accept fully Ferrand's identification of Jāvaka with Sumatra, treat Chandrabhānu accordingly as ruler of Śrī Vijaya, and attribute to the unfortunate expeditions of Candrabhānu against Ceylon a large share in bringing about the downfall of the Sumatran empire of Śrī Vijaya towards the end of the thirteenth century;[3] for the empire weakened by the reverses sustained by Candrabhānu was unable to resist aggressions of the Thai of Sukhodaya from the north and of King Kṛtanāgara from Java.

This thesis of Krom was the subject of a critical examination by Coedes[4] in the light of a fresh study of the Candrabhānu inscription of Jaiya (1230 A.D.) first published by him in 1918. He pointed out that there was no reason to consider Candrabhānu a ruler of Srī Vijaya, as neither Śrī Vijaya nor the Śailendravamśa was mentioned in his inscription of 1230 A.D. On the contrary, Candrabhānu describes himself as of the Padmavamśa or Kamalakula and as lord of the Pāñcāṇḍa-vamśa, whatever this may mean. It is best to regard him therefore as a local ruler of Tāmbralinga.

Coedes justifies the identification of Candrabhānu of the Jaiya inscription with Candrabhānu, the king of the Jāvakas, of the *Cūḷavamsa* narrative on two grounds: (1) the inhabitants of Tāmbralinga might well have been

---

[1] TBG. 64 (1924).

[2] BKI. 83 (1927), p. 463.

[3] *De Ondergang Van Crivijaya* as summarised by Coedes BKI. 83 (1927), p. 459.

[4] *A propos de la chute du Royaume de Crīvijaya*, BKI. 83 (1927).

described as Jāvakas, a general ethnic term as pointed out before, because, before the advent of the Thai, they differed little from the people of Sumatra, Jāvaka *par excellence*, and because Tāmbralinga had been for a time a dependency of Śrī Vijaya (Sumatra); (2) both the Candrabhānus are clearly Buddhists.

On the chronology of Candrabhanu's invasions, Coedes accepts a suggestion from Jouveau-Dubreuil, and applying a correction of fifteen years to Wijesimha's dates for Parakkamabāhu II, gets 1225-1260 as the period of his rule and places the two invasions against Ceylon in 1236 and 1256. He finds confirmation of these dates, particularly the second one, in a tradition preserved in the *Jinakālamālinī*, composed at the beginning of the 16th century. While it seems probable enough that the peaceful embassy to Ceylon from Siridhammarāja mentioned in the *Jinakālamālinī* has some relation to the facts mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa*,[1] I am not so sure that the work is of any great value. And the correction of fifteen years made on the suggestion of Jouveau-Dubreuil in the chronology of Wijesimha is somewhat arbitrary. The argument based on the chronology of the Pāṇḍyan civil war is not conclusive, because the chronology of the reign of Rājādhirāja II is involved in much obscurity, and it is by no means clear that the civil war commenced between 1163 and 1168. On the other hand, the scheme of chronology put forward recently by Geiger in his translation of the *Cūḷavamsa* is based on much careful research and, so far as I know, it works very well indeed from the standpoint of South Indian History. On this scheme we have seen that the two invasions fall in 1247 and say 1267-71. Even with these dates, there is no insuperable chronological difficulty in identifying Candrabhānu of the *Mahāvamsa* with his namesake of the Jaiya inscription; but if we assume that the second

[1] 'Il y a certainment quelque rapport entre les faits relates dans le mahavamsa, et., ceux que fait connaitre la *Jinakālamālinī*' Coedes, BKI. ibid p. 465.

invasion took place after the commencement of the reign of Vijayabāhu, *i.e.*, in 1271 or 1272, we get an unduly long interval between the Jaiya inscription and the second inroad.

Coedes finds another justification for his date, 1256, for the second inroad of Candrabhānu, and his line of argument, drawn from Pāṇḍyan inscriptions, is such as to lead him to the conclusion that the *Mahāvamsa* account of the second invasion of Candrabhānu and the narrative of the Ceylon campaign in Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscription are just different accounts of the same transactions. The position he takes is not without its difficulties, and he recognises them fully. He says:[1] "For what reason Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya turned in the sequel against his old ally the Jāvaka king, it is difficult to make out in the midst of the contradictory data furnished by Indian epigraphy and the Sinhalese chronicle. What was exactly the result of the campaign of 1256? The defeat of the king of Ceylon and of the king of the Jāvakas, say the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions;—a victory for the Sinhalese army and the defeat of the Jāvaka, says the *Mahāvamsa*. On a closer view, these answers, apparently contradictory, are in accord on one point: the defeat of the Jāvaka. The *Mahāvamsa*, in fact, speaks only of the defeat of the Jāvakas, without saying anything of their Indian allies, whose pretensions to victory are perhaps not wholly unjustified. It is after all the unhappy Candrabhānu that had to pay the whole cost of his enterprise."

Now let us see how, according to Coedes, the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions support the date 1256. Vīra Pāṇḍya's records fix his Ceylon expedition between 1254 and 1265; but his co-ruler Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions state that his conquest of Ceylon took place before his ninth year, *i.e.*, 1259, so that the actual date must lie between 1254 and 1259; we may therefore conclude that

---

[1] BKI. *ibid* p. 467.

the Pāṇḍyas who aided Candrabhānu in 1256 were no other than the two rulers just mentioned.

Plausible as this reasoning sounds, a closer analysis of the Pāṇḍyan records makes it difficult to accept it. We have shown above that Jaṭāvarman Sundara claims to have subjugated the Ceylonese ruler before 1258; but the campaign in which the Sāvagan is involved is not mentioned in any of Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscriptions earlier than 1263, and we do not get the details in the *tirumagaḷ Vaḷar* praśasti till the next year, though the praśasti itself occurs in inscriptions of the fourth and ninth years of Vīra Pāṇḍya, *i.e.*, of A.D. 1257 and 1262. We have therefore no reason to suppose that Sundara Pāṇḍya and Vīra Pāṇḍya fought together in the same campaign[1] or that that campaign was fought in 1256. In fact the date 1256 which appeared to Coedes the strongest point in his demonstration is not borne out in fact either by the *Mahāvamsa* or the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions, and that being so, not much importance can be attached to the evidence of the *Jinakālamālinī*.

Again it should be noted that we have no evidence that Candrabhānu and the Pāṇḍya king were friends in the first instance, and that the Pāṇḍya turned against Candrabhānu at a later stage. All that we learn from the *Mahāvamsa* is that before he undertook his second expedition against Ceylon, he recruited soldiers in the Pāṇḍya and Cōḷa countries, *i.e.*, in the Tamil country generally; and we have no reason to suppose that these soldiers were sent by the kings of the land, that, indeed, they were anything more than mere mercenaries in search of adventure and a livelihood.

---

[1] See the present writer's *Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, Chs. XI and XII for an account of the reigns of these kings. Sundara was doubtless the principal ruler assisted by Vīra Paṇḍya, and as Sundara was a great warrior, it is quite possible that early in his reign he fought in Ceylon and won some minor success. We have seen that the *Mahāvamsa* is silent on the Paṇḍyan inroads.

If we grant that the two Candrabhānus of Jaiya inscription and of the *Mahāvamsa* are identical, and further assume that the *Śāvagan* or the *Śāvagan-maindan* (son of the Śāvaga) of the inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya is also the same person, we get the following data regarding him:

1230 A. D.—Inscription of Jaya
1247 A. D.—First expedition against Ceylon
Before 1263 A. D.—Defeat at the hands of Vīra Pāṇḍya in Ceylon
C. 1270 A. D.—Second war with Ceylon aided by Damiḷa mercenaries.

Let me add that the evidence of Vīra Pāṇḍya's inscription from Kudumiyāmalai shows, not that Vīra Pāṇḍya was at first the ally of Candrabhānu and later on became his enemy and killed him as has been thought,[1] but rather that the Śāvaga was at first unwilling to acknowledge Vīra Pāṇḍya's suzerainty, that subsequently he made obeisance to Vīra Pāṇḍya (*talamirundiṟaiñja*), and he was duly rewarded by Vīra Pāṇḍya with presents and was allowed to rule Ceylon, perhaps a part of it, on the score that it was but proper that the son should rule the land once ruled by his father. It seems to me that all the facts attested by our sources can be accounted for only on one of two assumptions: either Candrabhānu of the Jaiya inscription was not identical with the other Candrabhānu, or some years after the Jaiya inscription he must have sought a career in Ceylon and met with a considerable amount of success in his endeavour. In any event, the Candrabhānu of the *Mahāvamsa*, if he was identical with the Śāvaga of the Pāṇḍya inscriptions, as perhaps he was,[2] found it possible to put up a big fight after a long interval after the first war with Parakkamabāhu, maintained diplomatic connections with the Pāṇḍyas,

---

[1] Coedes, BKI. *ibid*, p. 466.

[2] Candrabhānu is called the king of the Jāvakas in the *Mahāvamsa*, not of Jāvakam. And the Pāṇḍyan inscription speaks of a Śāvagan or Śāvagan maindan.

raised a Tamil army in South India to supplement the strength he derived from the nucleus of Malay adventurers who had gone over with him, and apparently ruled a part of Ceylon by right of conquest and perhaps even transmitted it to his son, though he had to acknowledge Pāṇḍyan suzerainty for a time.

Much still remains vague and uncertain; but the history of Ceylon is a confused tangle and the *Mahāvamsa* does not always tell the whole story. Tamil inscriptions also often exaggerate the achievements of Tamil kings of Ceylon. I have only sought to suggest a tentative hypothesis for reconciling all the authentic date we have been able to draw from our sources.

There remains the question whether the Śāvaga opponent of Vīra Pāṇḍya had anything to do with Kaḍāram, and whether we derive any light from the story of Candrabhānu's adventures on the downfall of the empire of Śrī Vijaya. Coedes says: 'The inscription of 1264 mentions the victory over the king of the Jāvakas, but does not speak of Kaḍāram; that of 1265 mentions the victory against Kaḍāram, but does not speak of the Jāvaka.' Kaḍāram then was under Candrabhānu, the ruler of Tāmbralinga, who, it has been shown had nothing to do with Śrī Vijaya or the Śailendras. It is clear that the designation 'king of Kaḍāram' applied to the Śailendras of Śrī Vijaya in the 11th century came to apply to a local ruler of Tāmbralinga by the middle of the 13th century. If we recall the importance of the possession of Kaḍāram to the prosperity of the maritime empire of Śrī Vijaya, we shall not be wrong in dating the decline of Śrī Vijaya from this period, if not earlier.[1]

It will be seen that the whole argument here rests on the supposed antithesis between the inscriptions of the tenth and eleventh years of Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya. This antithesis is however not real; for while both the inscriptions mention the defeat of the Śāvaka, the later record in more detail than the earlier, Kaḍāram occurs

[1] BKI. *ibid*, pp. 467-8.

only in the later record in an impossible list of states tributary to the Pāṇḍyan king. We have discussed this list already and shown that no historical value can attach to the inclusion of Kaḍāram in such a list. In short, we have no evidence that Candrabhānu of the Jaiya inscription had Kaḍāram under his control. For to include Kaḍāram among his possessions we must be able to establish two propositions: (1) that he was identical with the Ṡāvaka of the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions and (2) that the Pāṇḍyan records describe the Ṡāvagan as king of Kāḍaram. The first proposition is probable, though not demonstrably so; the dates on Geiger's scheme raise a doubt on this point. The second proposition seems to have its origin in the somewhat inaccurate summary of the inscription of the 11th year of Vīra Pāṇḍya given in the Madras Epigraphy report of 1912 and reproduced by Ferrand.

The other arguments adduced by Coedes for dating the decline of Śrī Vijaya from 1178 A.D. are left untouched by this result of our examination of the Pāṇḍyan inscriptions.

APPENDIX.

THE KUḌUMIYĀMALAI INSCRIPTION OF JAṬĀVARMAN VĪRA-PĀṆḌYADĒVA (356 OF 1906).

TEXT.

1. Tirumagaḷ vaḷar mulai tiru mārpu taḷaippa[1]
porumagaḷ vanamulai[2] puyam puṇarndu kaḷippa
nan-moḻi [3]nānmiśaic-conmagaḷ iruppa t-
tiśaigaḷ eṭṭinumiśaima-
gaḷ[4] vaḷara
2. iru mūnṟu samaiyamum oru mūnṟu tamiḻum
vēda nānkum nīdiyil viḷaṅga
Gangam Gauḍam Kaḍāram Kāśipam
Kongam Kudiram Kōsalam Māḷuvam
Arumaṇam Śōnagam Śīnam A
vanti
3. Karunaḍam Īḻam Kalingam Telingam
Pepaṇam Taṇḍagam[5] Paṇḍaram mudali(ya*)
embuli[6] vēndarum igal maṇḍalīgarum
mum-muraiśu muḻangum śemmaṇi māḷigai
kōyiṟ koṟṟa vāyiṟ pugundu
4. kālam pārttuk-kaḻal iṇai paṇindu
nīla vēḻamum nediyamum kāṭṭa
pūviri śōlaik-kāvikkaḷattu[7] c-
Cōḻan poruda vēḻappōril
madap-piṟṟāṟāk-kadak-kaḷi-yānai
tuḷakka (i*) c-cemboṟṟoḍikkaiyiṟ
5. vaḷaittu mēṟkoṇḍu vāgai piḍittu śūḍiya[8]
talaippērāṇmai tanittani-yeḍuttu
kalaikkavirājar kavinpeṟat-tudippa
śeṟṟa[9] mannar titāttiyāmal (?)[10]

---

[1] taḷaipaḍa
[2] vaḷarmulai
[3] Read nā-
[4] num Jayamagaḷ
[5] Tandaram
[6] eppuvi (?)
[7] Kāvirikkaḷattu
[8] śūḍi
[9] teṟṟa
[10] tiśaiyaṟiyāmal (?)

oṟṟai-yāḻi-yulagu valamā[1]
ē —
6. nai mannavar iṟaikoḍiṟaiñja[2]
mīnavar koḍi mēruvilōnga[3]
Vaḍuvarikkoḍungūl vaḻangā vaṇṇam
naḍuvu nilai śengōl nāḍoṟum naḍappa
ettiśaimannarum irungali kaḍindu
mutta ve —
7. ṇkuḍai muḻunilavu śoriya
oru moḻi tarippap-puvi muḻudundan
mada-mārpu viḷanga maṇi-muḍi śūḍi
urai keḻu (mara*)pil araiśiyal vaḻakkam
neṟippaḍa nāṭṭum kuṟippinul ...... ṭṭiśain (da*)
tiruppādam śe .... tirunda mandiri
8. śaraṇamai tigaḻndinidu nōkki muraṇmigu śiṟappil
Īḻamannar[4] ilaguvaril oruvanai
vīḻapporudu[5] viṇmiśai-yēṟṟi
urimaiccuṟṟamum uykulam pukkut-
tarumai yāṇmaiyum pala-
9. paḍaippuraviyum
kanamaṇittērum śinavaḍam(ā*) rum
nāgattōḍum navamaṇikkuvaiyum
āḍagattiriyum[6] ari—āśanamum
muḍiyum kaḍgamum muḻumaṇi-yāramum
koḍiyun-guḍaiyum kuḷir veṇkavariyum
muraśuñ-jan—
10. gamum taṇḍu mudali(ya*)
arairukeḻu dāyam aḍaiya vāri
Kāṇāmannavar kaṇḍu kaṇḍēnga
Kōṇamalaiyinum Tirikūḍagiriyinum
urukeḻu koḍimiśai-yiru kayoleḻudi
ēnaivendanai ānai tiṟai koṇḍu
11. paṇḍ-
ēval śeyyādigal śeydirunda
Śāva(ga*)n maindan talami[7]rundiṟaiñja
vīrakkaḻal vira(va*) laraic-cūṭṭit-

---

1 yulaguḷalamara (?)
2 iḍaṟkodiṟaindu
3 So Dalapatisamudram version (8 of 1929). Others read *Koḍitteruvilēnga*
4 Īḻḻa-
5 viḻḻa-
6 -kkiriyum (?)
7 nalam-

tirukkoḷam alaivāppaḍan kaḻittu (?)
vaḻangi aruḷi muḻangu kaḷiṟēṟi
pār muḻudaṟiya ūrva-
12. lañje(y*) vittu
tandai yāṇḍa tadangaḍal-Īḻam
maindaṉ pe......gum[1] marapena ninaippiṭ-
ṭaraiśiḍa magindu ānūrpuriccu (?)[2]
viraiyaccelgena viḍaikoḍuttaruḷi
yāgam aḍandai anbudan śātti
vāgai śūḍa ma-
13. dumaṇagamaḻa
vārndaveṇkavarin vāḍalun-denṟalum
vēndar vīśa vīraśingādanattu
kapakandaḻuviya kāmar valla......
14. ......da
poṟṟoḍi punaindu malarnda malarkkoḻum
paripuraicciṟṟaḍi ulagamuḻuduḍaiyāroḍum
vīṟṟirundaruḷiya svasti śrī ko-
15. ccaḍaipanmarāna tiripuvanaccakkaravattigaḷ
śiri Vīrapāṇḍiya dēvarku yandu 11—vadu
173 nāl ....

Abstract of contents (with some notes).

Lines 1—4.

To *nediyamum-kāṭṭa*—Rhetorical praise of the king's rule. Unhistorical. Note the list of tributary countries (Gangam to Paṇḍaram) which includes Kaḍāram as the third name; only one version of the *praśasti* omits it.

Lines 4—5.

puviri śolai to *tudippa.* A fight at Kāvi(ri)kkaḷam with the Cōḷa king in which Vīra Pāṇḍya captured several elephants, a victory praised by poets in many ways.

Lines 5—7.

śeṟṟa mannar ... maṇi muḍiśuḍi: the distress of enemy kings, the power and justice of Pāṇḍyan rule. From this point all versions of this *praśasti* except the Kuḍumiyāmalai one pass direct to l. 12 *yāgamaḍandai, etc.*

Lines 7—12.

Account of Ceylon expedition: opens with an appeal from the Ceylonese minister (*mandiri*) to the Pāṇḍya, and the defeat and death of one Ceylonese king (*oruvanai vīḻapporudu viṇmiśaiyēṟṟi*) and capture of his paraphernalia, the setting up of the flag of victory on

---

[1] These words are omitted in the Pudukkottah text.
[2] Anurāpurikku (?)

the Kōṇamalai and Trikūṭagiri and the subjugation of another king (*ēnai vendanai ānai tiṟaikoṇḍu*), and finally from (*paṇḍēval*) comes the reference to *Śāva*(*ga*) *n-maindan*, his initial contumacy, later submission, the rewards he received, the procession on an elephant and his restoration to the kingdom of Ceylon (*taḍangaḍal Īḻam*) once ruled by is father (*tandai-yāṇḍa*).

Lines 13—15.

Rhetorical end.